DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 128 JC 790 586

AUTHOR Petersen, Allen; And Others
TITLE Community College Grading Policies. Agenda Item 5.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE 26 Oct 79
NOTE 33p.; Recommendations presented at the meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Sacramento, CA, October 26, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Failure; Academic Probation; *Administrative Policy; Community Colleges; Credit No Credit Grading; Definitions; Equivalency Tests; *Grades (Scholastic); *Grading; *Junior Colleges; *State Legislation; *State Standards; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *California; Course Repetition; Course Withdrawal

ABSTRACT

Because of a wide diversity of grading practices and policies among California community colleges, its impact upon students, and the need for compliance with state minimum standards, a study group was appointed to examine existing regulations and make recommendations to promote commonality among grading policies. Issues such as local autonomy, "penalty" and "non-penalty" grading, and flexibility were considered in developing the recommendations. These include: (1) that a uniform statewide grading scale be established including standardized definitions for both evaluative (A=excellent, B=good, C=satisfactory, D=passing but less than satisfactory, F=failing, CR=credit, and NC=no credit) and non-evaluative (I=incomplete, IP=in progress, RD=report delayed, X=credit by examination, and W=withdrawal) symbols; (2) that there be a more restrictive use and meaning of "W"; (3) that probation based on excessive accumulation of grades of "NC" and "W" be evidence of lack of academic progress; and (4) that a concept of dismissal for unremediated academic probation and progress probation be established. Recommendations were also developed regarding credit/no credit grading, grade changes, course repetition, final exams, credit by examination, and notification of probation. Specific policies and rationales are suggested and relevant sections of Title 5 of the California Education Code are presented. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178128

Community College Grading Policies

Agenda Item 5

Allen Petersen
Administrator
Program Evaluation and Approval

Office of the Chancellor
California Community Colleges

Prepared for the October 26, 1979 Meeting of the
Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

JC 790 586

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Off. of the Chancellor
Calif. Comm. Colleges
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges
October 26, 1979

Item 5

Title: Community College Grading Policies

Staff presentation: Allan Petersen, Administrator
Program Evaluation and Approval

Summary

1. The Through the Open Door study, completed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission in 1976, and a follow-up study of community college grading policies by the Chancellor's Office in 1978, indicated a wide diversity of grading practices and policies among community colleges.

2. Because of this diversity, its impact upon students, and the need for compliance with state minimum standards, the Board of Governors a year ago asked the Chancellor to take some appropriate action. The Chancellor in January of 1979 appointed five faculty members four administrators, and one student to a special grading policies study group (see Appendix A). The study group was charged with examining existing regulations on selected grading policies and making recommendations to insure a reasonable degree of commonality among such policies.

3. The study group's recommendations are detailed in the body of this agenda item along with the proposed Title 5 regulations. Briefly stated, the most important of the study group's recommendations are:

   -- that a uniform statewide grading scale be established including standardized definitions for both evaluative and nonevaluative symbols

   -- that the same grading symbols, definitions, and grade points be available for use by all community college instructors

   -- that there be a more restrictive use and meaning to the "W" symbol

   -- that probation based on excessive accumulation of grades of "NC" and "W" be evidence of lack of academic progress

   -- that a concept of dismissal for unremediated academic probation and progress probation be established

4. The study group's work already reflects considerable input from the field and the Chancellor's Office staff. As is always the case when dealing with sensitive issues, compromises have been reached, and some issues raised in the two studies that preceded these recommendations have been left unattended. Furthermore, the central issue of local autonomy versus state control and the related issue of the extent and purpose of state minimum standards make it difficult to achieve consensus among the various interest groups.

   The specific set of standards that are proposed in this item are to some an inappropriate intrusion into local control--but to others seem barely sufficient to head off a practice construed to be a relaxation of standards and a denial to students of equality of opportunity. Others are of the opinion that had the Chancellor's Office monitored the use of existing grading regulations and insisted upon compliance, the current situation would not have arisen.

5. Since this matter is presented to the Board of Governors in October as an informational item no staff recomendations are included. An action item will be brought back to the Board in December 1979, or early in 1980, after initial discussion with the Board in October, after a third public hearing November 16, and after a final meeting of the grading policies study group November 20, 1979.

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
GRADING POLICIES STUDY GROUP
RECOMMENDATIONS
September 13, 1979

I. INTRODUCTION

Both the California Postsecondary Education Commission's (CPEC) study, Through the Open Door (1976), and a subsequent study conducted by Chancellor Craig's staff indicate that equality of opportunity to students served by the state's community colleges is being denied through wide variations in student accounting procedures and grading policies among the colleges. Moreover, the studies indicate that at least some of these inequities result from confusion about and failure to comply with existing Title 5 regulations and the State Education Code. Additionally, findings resulting from polls (1977) of the community colleges faculty conducted by the Statewide Academic Senate indicate that many of the present grading policies adversely affect academic standards.

Because of the Board of Governors' keen interest in an equitable resolution to these and other problems associated with grading policies, the Chancellor in January, 1979, appointed five faculty members, four administrators, and one student to a grading policies study group.

The Grading Policies Study Group was charged with examining existing state regulations and policy statements and practices pertaining to grading policies on the various college campuses and making recommendations to obtain solutions to problems associated with them where such solutions may be obtainable through state regulation.

After examination of considerable data including the above mentioned documents as well as the CCJCA response to Through the Open Door, the resolutions adopted by the Spring, 1979, Convention of the Academic Senate, the Academic Standards Report of the Los Angeles Community College District, statistical data developed by the Chancellor's staff, and an extensive list of other documents, the Study Group determined that in order to develop a workable framework for discussion, research, and recommendation, it would be necessary to focus its attention on a limited list of subjects which seemed most pertinent to the major areas of concern and which seemed most amenable to positive reform through modification of Title 5 regulations.

The following subject areas were finally determined to be within that manageable framework and were assigned to teams of two committee members each for additional research and the development of position papers for review by the entire committee:

A. Grading symbols and definitions
B. Credit/No Credit issues
C. Grade Changes
D. Course repetition
E. Final Examinations
F. Credit by Examination
G. Probation
H. Dismissal
I. Auditing
J. Compliance (This subject area was expanded and dealt with in earlier drafts, but was finally deleted from the body of this report. The study group decided that the compliance issue was one that touched upon all of the Board of Governor's minimum standards and, therefore, needed broader more complete attention, see additional comments in addendum #2.)

In developing this list, the committee also determined that some issues such as limitations on categories of credit applicable for degrees, or the question of academic renewal, and others which are unquestionably a part of grading policy considerations, nevertheless impinge so greatly on other broad areas of academic concern that they should be addressed by another group--perhaps the Chancellor's Task Force on General Education and Graduation Requirements.

Very early in its work, the committee also agreed upon the following format for the presentation of its recommendations:

A. Statement of present Title 5 regulations
B. Statement of recommendation (change or status quo)
C. Statement of rationale

Other procedural matters addressed by the committee included the election of a faculty member as chair, establishing provisions for written agenda and the recording of minutes of the meetings. Secretarial and technical support were supplied by the Chancellor's staff.

During the Spring, 1979, the study group met in six all-day meetings during which it drafted a series of tentative recommendations based on the additional research and writing of its two person "teams." These initial recommendations were presented to the Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Governors at its public meeting, June 1, 1979, for reactions and suggestions. Subsequently, on June 4, 1979, a modified version of these early recommendations was mailed by the Chancellor's staff to all Superintendent/Presidents, Faculty Senate Presidents, and other educational groups interested in community college education to attend an open meeting of the Study Group held June 20, 1979 to respond to a more complete set of study group recommendations which the group had developed in two full-day June meetings. Approximately 50 persons responded to the invitation and engaged in a lively exchange of ideas and recommendations among themselves and with the members of the study group.

In addition to this oral response, approximately 50 written responses, representing the views of individual faculty members, administrators, groups, and campuses have been received by the study group along with numerous telephone calls. From these reactions together with technical advice from the Chancellor's staff given to committee members during an all-day meeting July 13, 1979, the group decided upon significant revisions to its formative recommendations. These were incorporated in a revised version of the proposal and submitted to the Chancellor's staff for detailed technical and legal review. These materials were then reviewed by a subcommittee of the study group and the Chancellor's Office staff September 20, 1979 for clarity and organization.

The recommendations were presented again to the Board of Governors Education Policy Committee and the field October 5 in the format of a second public hearing. A massive mail out of the report preceded that meeting. The study group met again the afternoon of October 5 and, among other actions, eliminated from the body of the report the recommendations dealing with compliance issues.

In the development of its recommendations the committee found it necessary to address many issues and positions in the process of its study of grading policies; the following, however, are major concerns which underlie and form the basis for its specific recommendations:

1. The question of local autonomy. The study group recognizes that the proposed changes in grading policy are contrary to the present policies contained in Title 5 which encourage local option, and that there are members of the college community who have serious reservations about any proposed state standardization. The study group believes that where a choice must be made between local autonomy and equity for students, the principle of equality of opportunity for students must prevail.

2. The question of state minimum standards. The study group discussed at length whether or not it was appropriate to recommend the establishment of specific standards in many areas of grading policy rather than to retain and/or modify the concept of state minimum standards now employed in Title 5. It finally concluded that in certain areas of grading policies continuation of the concept of minimum standards would fail to remedy the problems associated with the variable local standards permitted under present policy.

3. The question of "penalty" and "non-penalty" grading systems. In recommending the continuation of the traditional grading system including the grade symbols "D," and "F," as well as placing limitations on the use of the "W," "I," and "NC," the committee is aware that there are those within the community college establishment who interpret such symbols and strictures as "penalties" and their absence, as "non-penalty." In reaching its decisions regarding the specific symbols, definitions, and uses thereof, the study group has borne this fact in mind, as well as the considerations which follow, and the study group believes that the use of the terms "penalty" and "non-penalty" is inappropriate.

First of all, the purpose for which grading symbols and grading scales have been established is to provide as accurate a shorthand account of the faculty's assessment of a student's educational progress and/or performance as possible. It seems clear that, where failure as well as outstanding success is possible, provision must be made to record both. Secondly, the committee is mindful of the number of relief measures available to students who are experiencing difficulty in achieving their educational goals. These include provisions for grade forgiveness and academic renewal, programs of all types for remediation of basic skills, counseling assistance, and grievance procedures to adjudicate grading practices where faculty are perceived to be unfair, incompetent, etc. With these provisions and the professional use of a well-defined, understandable range of evaluative symbols, far from penalizing students with low grades and/or jeopardizing their educational progress, colleges should be better able to identify those who need help and provide them with needed assistance to achieve their educational objectives.

It should also be observed that under a given set of circumstances with an individual student's specific objectives, any letter grade which assigns less than the maximum number of the grade points possible, could be interpreted as a penalty if the grading process is perceived in that manner. It is the responsibility of all staff members of a college to promote the view that standardized grading constitutes a fair, equitable and beneficial evaluation of student performance and not a penalty upon students.

4. The question of flexibility. Although the study group is recommending the retention of the traditional grading scale, additional flexibility is needed to report accurately the progress of students.

   For this reason, the committee is recommending the retention of the "CR/NC" symbols with some modifications as explained in the body of the document, and the introduction and use of the "IP" symbol to denote classes crossing the normal end of an academic term.

   Finally, it should be said that while all members of the study group contributed to the development of these recommendations, and all worked to develop a clear, understandable set of regulations which would resolve many of the problems associated with the present policies and ultimately provide a more equitable opportunity for the state's communities to achieve their educational goals, no committee member subscribes to these recommendations in their entirety as fully expressing each persons view.

II. STUDY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. ACADEMIC RECORD SYMBOLS AND DEFINITIONS

1. Evaluative Symbols:

Recommendation:

The study group recommends that a uniform statewide grading scale be established; that the symbols be available for use by all community college instructors within the guidelines established by Title 5 regulations and the state Education Code; and that Title 5 regulations include the following grading symbols, corresponding definitions and grade points:

Symbol	Definition	Grade Points
A	Excellent	4
B	Good	3
C	Satisfactory	2
D	Passing, less than satisfactory	1
F	Failing	0
CR	Credit (at least satisfactory - units awarded not counted in GPA)	
NC	No Credit (less than satisfactory or failing - units not counted in GPA)	

Rationale:

The rationale for this recommendation is discussed at some length in the introductory remarks and is based primarily upon the need to rectify the current situation in which wide variations in grading symbols, their use, and definitions have resulted in inequitable treatment of students. This is a problem explored in Through the Open Door, the Chancellor's Staff's response to it, and the CCJCA response. The most obvious example is revealed in the statistical data supplied by both the Chancellor's staff and the Academic Senate's poll of the faculty which indicate that 22% of the community colleges presently do not permit use of a letter grade equivalent to 0 grade points. This discriminates against students in the majority of the colleges, where such a grade is used. The practice distorts the comparative grade point averages for all community college students, denies to the faculty the ability to indicate the lack of success of a given student, and misleads the student, employer and other academicians, as to the student's skill and/or knowledge. This prohibition is in violation of existing Title 5 regulation (Section 51306(a)), and is also, in the opinion of the study group, a violation of the state Education Code, Section 76224, which gives the instructor the right to determine a student's grade.

The recommendation to establish a uniform grading scale, with uniform definitions for use in all community colleges is supported by resolutions adopted at the Spring, 1979, Convention of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.

The selection of symbols and their definitions and grade points was made by the study group from a compilation of numerous symbols supplied by the Chancellor's staff and which appear to be those most universally understood and used. The specific recommendation that the "CR" symbol be defined as "at least satisfactory," is intended to clarify scattered references to it as "satisfactory" in existing Title 5 regulations and also to provide greater ease in transferring such units to the other public segments of California post-secondary education which now universally define the symbol as the equivalent of a "C" grade or better. The recommendation that the "NC" be defined as "unsatisfactory" logically follows from the definition of "CR" and permits the repetition of such course work under other provisions contained in Title 5.

2. Non-evaluative Symbols:

Recommendation:

The study group recommends that the following non-evaluative symbols together with the definitions, rules and procedures described below be used as required at all California Community Colleges in order to provide greater flexibility and more accurate record keeping than that possible by using only the above evaluative scale.

Symbol	Definition
I	Incomplete

The conditions for assigning an "I" shall be restricted to situations in which the instructor in consultation with the student concludes that because of unforeseeable, but fully justifiable, reasons a clearly identifiable portion of a course requirement, e.g., a final examination or major paper, cannot be completed within the academic term. The conditions for removal of the "I" shall be stated by the instructor in a written record and given to the student with a copy placed on file with the registrar until the "I" is removed or the time limit for removal has passed. A final grade shall be assigned when the work agreed upon has been completed and evaluated.

An "I" may be removed no later than one year following the end of the term in which it was assigned. If the "I" is not removed within the prescribed time limit, in courses graded on the A - F scale, it shall be converted to an evaluative letter grade. In courses evaluated on a "CR/NC" basis, the unremediated "I" shall be counted as an "NC".

The governing board shall provide a process whereby a student may petition for a time extension due to extraordinary circumstances.

Rationale:

The limitations placed on the use of the "I" are designed to encourage students to complete course requirements unless extreme circumstances prevent them from doing so. They are further intended to indicate that an "I" should be assigned neither to permit students to improve a final grade by the late completion of minor assignments, nor to let students obtain unauthorized end-of-the term withdrawals.

Symbol	Definition
IP	In progress

The "IP" symbol shall be used to denote that the class extends beyond the normal end of an academic term. It indicates that work is in progress but that assignment of a substantive grade must await completion of additional work. The "IP" symbol shall remain on the student's permanent record in order to satisfy enrollment documentation. The appropriate evaluative symbol and unit credit shall be assigned and appear on the student's record for the term in which the course is completed. The "IP" shall not be used in calculating grade point averages.

RD	Report Delayed

The "RD" symbol may be assigned by the registrar only. It is to be used when there is a delay in reporting the grade of a student due to circumstances beyond the control of the student. It is a temporary notation to be replaced by a substantive grading symbol as soon as possible. "RD" shall not be used in calculating grade point averages.

X	Credit by examination

All grades earned through credit by examination shall have letter "X" added to the evaluative symbol in order to identify such course credit for the purpose of establishing enrollment documentation and placing such other limitations as are generally associated with such credit.

Symbol	Definition
W	Withdrawal (Authorized)

Withdrawal from a class or classes shall be authorized during the first 11 weeks or 60% of the academic term, whichever is less.

No notation shall be made on the academic record of the student who withdraws during the first 4 weeks or 30% of the term, whichever is less.

Withdrawal between the fourth and eleventh weeks (or between 30 and 60% points) of the term shall be recorded as "W" on the student's record.

During the final 40% or after the eleventh week of the term, withdrawals shall not be authorized except for serious and compelling reasons clearly beyond the student's control. All requests to withdraw under these circumstances shall be in writing and shall require the approval of the appropriate college administrator.

Within these guidelines, criteria and procedures for withdrawal shall be established by local boards and published in campus catalogs.

The "W" shall not be used in calculating grade point averages, but excessive "W's" as defined by local boards shall be used as factors in probation and dismissal procedures.

Rationale:

College policies relating to the use of the "W" vary greatly and are so extensive that only the most significant are summarized here as follows:

The "W" has been the symbol used to indicate official withdrawal from classes initiated by the student; it has also been used to indicate the exclusion from classes for nonattendance or other reasons; and it has been used by instructors in lieu of issuing unsatisfactory letter grades at the end of the term.

Excessive "W's," as defined by the individual college districts, may be counted as factors in probation and dismissal procedures. Attendance keeping devices generally provide for the use of the "W" only, regardless of the time in the term it is used. This prevents the assignment of any other symbol for late withdrawing and/or non-attending students. Some colleges designate a period at the beginning of each term during which withdrawals need not be recorded in any manner on the student's record. Some colleges discourage "late" withdrawals with catalog statements which threaten "F's" for failure to properly withdraw. Other colleges permit the recording of "W's" through and after the final examination period.

The results of this diversity are widely viewed as detrimental to the educational programs of the community colleges and are so perceived by the study group.

Accounting data related to drop dates, census weeks, etc. are questionable at best due to the diverse use of the "W" as both an indicator of authorized and late withdrawals, and as an end of the semester letter "grade."

These variations in use also indicate considerable inequity in the treatment of students, since the records of students at colleges which permit end-of-term withdrawals or which do not use the "W" for probation or dismissal purposes, do reflect better scholastic performance than those with more restrictive policies.

The widespread use of the "W" as an end-of-term grade is selectively discriminatory in another manner since certain students--notably those receiving financial aid--must receive an evaluative grade indicating completion of a course. "W" does not satisfy this requirement and these students are denied or must repay funds if it is used.

Many faculty feel that the policies listed above also contribute to the lowering of academic standards, and note among many the following detrimental results:

The variety of policies and the permissiveness of some policies regarding drop dates and/or probation and dismissal encourage irresponsible practices on the part of students. The widespread use of the "W" as a terminal "grade" places considerable pressure on faculty members to use that symbol when in reality they wish to evaluate the student's class performance.

For these reasons, the study group has attempted to provide a uniform policy statement concerning the "W" which will separate it as an accounting symbol from the evaluation process; will take into consideration the legitimate needs of the community colleges' varied student population to withdraw when they feel it is desirable; and at the same time will encourage the responsible use of a valuable and costly educational system.

The recommendation that excessive "W's" subject students to probation and/or dismissal procedures is intended to encourage and enable the colleges to provide counseling and other services to assist these students in completing their educational programs.

The recommendation that withdrawal be related to percentages of the academic term rather than to census dates is also intended to separate accounting procedures from grading policy and to provide more appropriately for flexible school calendar scheduling. It should be noted, however, that the recommended percentage divisions do closely coincide with the presently established census dates.

B. CREDIT/NO CREDIT

Recommendation:

The study group recommends that the existing Title 5 Sections 51302 and 51308 (see Appendix B) be combined under one number and heading and be modified as follows:

1. A community college governing board may by resolution and regulation offer courses in the following categories and shall specify in its catalog the category into which each course falls:

   a. Courses wherein all students are evaluated on a credit/no credit basis.

   b. Courses wherein each student may elect upon registration or within the first 30% of the term whether the basis of the student's evaluation is to be a "credit/no credit" or a letter grade.

2. When a district offers courses in which there is a single satisfactory standard of performance for which unit credit is assigned, the "CR/NC" grading system shall be used to the exclusion of other grades. Credit shall be assigned for meeting that standard, no credit for failure to do so.

3. The governing board may authorize a student who has received credit for a course taken on a "CR/NC" basis within the district to change this to a grade based on a grading scale by taking an appropriate examination.

   Such authorization shall conform to the standards for repeating enrollment contained in Section 55002(f).

4. All units earned on a "CR/NC" basis in accredited post-secondary institutions shall be counted in satisfaction of equivalent community college requirements.

5. Credit/no credit units shall not be used to calculate grade point averages. Nevertheless, units attempted for which a "NC" is recorded shall be used as a factor in probation and dismissal procedures.

Rationale:

Sections 51302 and 51308 are currently almost identical; however, the minor differences in wording contained in the two sections are significant and confusing to the reader. Therefore, the study group recommends that they be combined.

The recommendation to change the permissive but differing time periods currently allowed under Sections 51302 and 51308 noted in 1 (a) above to one standardized period is consistent with other recommendations based on the need for greater equity for students. The variation which now exists in local policies ranges from require-

ing students to make the "Credit/No Credit" decision at registration to permitting them the option to the end of the academic term. This recommendation is also consistent with the time period allowed under the recommended "W" policy for unrecorded withdrawals.

The recommendation in 2 above is designed to provide a consistent, understandable framework for recording unit credit in courses in which single objectives and/or standards are established and unit credit is assigned when these objectives are met. No comparison with other students is included, nor are variations in quality of performance or achievement considered in awarding credit. It is inappropriate, therefore, for symbols--frequently the "A"--from the traditional grading scale to be assigned in these courses.

C. GRADE CHANGES

Recommendation:

The study group recommends:

that the conditions under which grades may be changed continue to be restricted to those provisions allowable under Education Code 76224, i.e., where instructor error, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency is found; or under Title 5 provisions allowing the conversion of "credit" to a letter grade as modified above; or under provisions for course repetition as provided in Section 51315 as modified;

that when erroneous notations as indicated under Education Code 76224 are determined to be present on a student's permanent record, the correction procedure shall include expunging them;

that when a grade is changed under either of the other permissible provisions, the permanent record shall be annotated in such a way that all work remains legible insuring a true and complete academic history;

that Title 5 require district governing boards to develop and publish policies and procedures for grade changes as permitted in EC 76224, Title 5, Sections 51302 (c) and 51308 (c) as modified.

Rationale:

These recommendations are designed to clarify and bring consistency and equity to the permanent records of students, and to emphasize the limitations on grade changes.

D. COURSE REPETITION

Recommendations:

The study group recommends:

that the term "substandard" currently undefined in the Title 5 sections applicable to course repetition and academic renewal be defined in these and any other sections of Title 5 as meaning course work for which the grading symbols D, F, and/or NC have been recorded;

that the statement "In such cases, unusual circumstances which justify the repetition of enrollment will be deemed to exist, and the procedure specified in Section 55002 (f) of this part shall be followed" be expunged and that the similar reference to Section 55002 (f) contained in Section 51316 (d) likewise be expunged and that a simple statement requiring the prior written permission from the district superintendent or authorized representative be substituted in both places for the language removed;

that section 55002 pertaining to the standards for a graded course be modified to permit course repetition for substandard work as defined and regulated in sections 51315 and 51316;

that course repetition be permitted when the governing board has designated certain courses that may be repeated for credit. Such courses will be so designated in the college catalog. Courses so designated must provide for either 1) a substantive change in subject matter, e.g., independent study, or 2) increasing levels of student performance.

Rationale:

The lack of a definition for "substandard" work has led to situations on some campuses in which any course work for which a grade less than an "A" has been recorded is defined as "substandard." This seems to the group to be a poor definition of substandard and is educationally unsound. The inclusion of the recommended definition should remove all ambiquity as to the meaning and intent of the provisions pertaining to repetition of substandard work.

The recommendations pertaining to modification of 55002 are designed to remove the inherent contradictions between the sections. Furthermore, it removes from the Title 5 regulations the pretense that substandard course work is, or should be deemed to be, "unusual." Clearly, this is contrary to all known educational data.

E. FINAL EXAMS

Recommendation:

The study group recommends that Title 5 remain silent on the question of final examinations.

Rationale

Whether final exams are required or not should be a function of the instructional objectives of any particular course and should be so indicated in course outlines. The consequences of the failure to take a final exam should depend upon the relationship of that exam to the structure of the course.

F. CREDIT BY EXAMINATION

Recommendation:

The study group recommends that Title 5 regulations pertaining to Credit by Examination be modified by adding the following provisions:

1. That governing boards develop and publish regulations providing for Credit by Examination consistent with provisions for Grading Practices, Section 51301 as modified below, and with the provisions for Grade Changes and Course Repetition provided in Title 5.

2. All grades earned through credit by examination shall have the letter "X" added to the evaluative symbol in order to identify such course credit for the purpose of establishing enrollment documentation and placing such other limitations as are generally associated with such credit.

3. That Section 51301, Grading Practices, (b) be modified to read: Be graded in accordance with the provisions of Section 51302 or Section 51302.5.

Rationale:

Section 51301 presently seems to require that Credit by Examination be graded on a Credit/No credit option only. The study group perceives that this is too restrictive a requirement. The decision as to whether a course challenged by examination should be graded according to the grading scale or on a credit/no credit basis should depend upon the instructional objectives of the particular course and should be left to the judgment of the faculty designing or approving the examination.

Other recommendations are intended to bring consistency and equity to these regulations.

G. PROBATION

Recommendation:

That Title 5, Section 51303 be worded as follows:

51303. Standards for Probation (a) A student who has attempted 12 semester or 16 quarter units shall be placed on academic probation if the student has earned a grade point average below 2.0 in all units attempted which were graded on the basis of the grading scale described in Section 51306.

(b) A student who has enrolled in a total of at least 12 semester or 16 quarter units as shown by the official academic record shall be placed on progress probation when the percentage of units attempted for which entries of "W" and "NC" are recorded reaches or exceeds a standard which shall be established by the local governing board.

(c) A student on probation for a grade point deficiency shall be removed from probation when the student's accumulated grade point average is 2.0 or higher; a student on probation on the basis of too high a percentage of units for which entries of "W" and "NC" are recorded shall be removed from probation when that percentage drops below the percentage set by the local governing board.

Rationale:

The study group recommends the continuation of the present Title 5 regulations with some minor changes in order to:

1. Warn students when their grade point average indicates serious educational difficulties.

2. Enable colleges to identify and offer assistance to student in academic diffculty so that they become aware of the reasons for their lack of success and may take steps to remedy their educational weaknesses.

The addition of the requirement that students be placed on probation when their units of uncompleted course work exceed a standard established by the local school board, is designed to make students aware that lack of progress in numbers of units completed is a sign of educational weakness, and it is also part of the effort to bring students to understand the importance of their own commitment to the educational process.

The new recommendations also establish specific provisions for the removal of a student from the condition of probation. Few districts were publishing such regulations.

H. DISMISSAL

Recommendation:

The study group recommends that Title 5, Section 51304 be reworded as follows:

51304. Standards for Dismissal. A student who has been placed on academic probation shall be dismissed if the student has a cumulative grade point average of less than 1.75 after attendance in at least 4 consecutive semesters (6 consecutive quarters) which were graded on the basis of the grading scale described in Section 51306.

A student who has been placed on progress probation shall be subject to dismissal if the percentage of units in which the student has enrolled and for which entries of "W" and "NC" are recorded for at least 4 consecutive semesters (6 consecutive quarters) reaches or exceeds a standard set by the local governing board.

The local governing board shall establish provisions for appeal of dismissal and for reinstatement.

The local governing board shall adopt rules setting forth the circumstances that shall warrant exceptions to the standards for dismissal herein set forth and shall file a copy of such rules with the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.

Rationale:

The primary purposes in providing for a dismissal policy is: 1) to insure that no student's academic deficiency becomes too difficult to remediate, 2) to give the student the opportunity to reflect before applying for reinstatement, 3) to emphasize the public's and the Colleges' insistence that the students make satisfactory use of the educational services provided.

I. Auditing

Recommendation:

The study group recommends that Title 5 remain silent on the question of auditing.

An auditor shall be defined as a "registered student attending a course without working for or expecting to receive formal credit."

Rationale:

Although the committee recognizes that there is a category of non-traditional students interested in attending college credit courses without a corresponding interest in receiving credit for the course, or in participating in classroom activities, and/or completing other course requirements, after considerable discussion it concluded that formalizing this activity in Title 5 regulations is not in the best interests of the community colleges' programs nor in the best interests of regularly enrolled students for the following reasons:

1. Combining in one classroom students committed formally to subject matter objectives, classroom activities, and expectations of achievement, with students not so committed would distort the educational program and atmosphere of the class and multiply instructional problems. This would be particularly true if auditing were encouraged and significant numbers of students enrolled under auditing provisions.

2. Since, under the current provision of the Education Code and Title 5 regulations, colleges could not receive state funding for auditors, formalizing auditing in all probability would introduce a fee structure for credit classes. The study group felt that this could lead to the undermining of the concept of the tuition-free, open-door community colleges and is thus not in the best interests of the majority of the communities they serve.

3. Finally, it seemed apparent to the study group that various non-credit community services programs if properly adapted to the needs of individual communities should be able to provide the educational services desired by most potential auditors. For others, insistent on attending graded courses, the CR/NC option which permits a more relaxed attention to course work should fulfill the need in a manner which would not distort the classroom structure.

J. NOTIFICATION OF PROBATION

The study group also recommends that Title 5, Section 51307 be revised as follows:

51307. Notification of Probation and Dismissal. Each community college shall make every reasonable effort to notify a student of probation or dismissal at or near the beginning of the semester or quarter in which it will take effect but, in any case, no later than the start of the fall semester or quarter. Each community college shall also make every reasonable effort to provide counseling and other support services to a student on probation to help the student overcome any academic difficulties. Each community college shall make every reasonable effort to notify a student of removal from probation or reinstatement after dismissal within timelines established by the district. Probation and dismissal policies and procedures shall be published in the college catalog.

Finally, the study group recommends that a student placed on probation should be required to see a counselor.

Title 5 Revisions in Accordance
with Grading Policy Study Group Recommendations

II. A. Academic Record Symbols and Definitions

51306. Academic Record Symbols and Grade Point Average. (a) Grades from a grading scale shall be averaged on the basis of the point equivalencies to determine a student's grade point average. The highest grade shall receive four points, and the lowest grade shall receive 0 points, using with the following evaluative symbols:

Symbol	Definition	Grade Points
A	Excellent	4
B	Good	3
C	Satisfactory	2
D	Passing, less than satisfactory	1
F	Failing	0
CR	Credit (at least satisfactory-units awarded not counted in GPA)	
NC	No Credit (less than satisfactory, or failing-units not counted in GPA)	

(b) The governing board for each Community College shall ~~establish~~ publish the point equivalencies for the grades used in ~~from the grading scale at that Community College in accordance with~~ subsection (a) of this section ~~These equivalencies shall be published~~ in the catalog of that Community College as a part of its ~~the~~ grading practices. ~~for that Community College.~~

History: 1. Amendment filed 11-4-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 45).

(c) The governing board of each Community College district may authorize the use of only the following non-evaluative symbols:

Symbol	Definition
I	Incomplete: Incomplete academic work for unforeseeable, emergency and justifiable reasons at the end of the term may result in an "I" symbol being entered in the student's record. The condition for removal of the "I" shall be stated by the instructor in a written record after consultation with the student. This record must be given to the student with a copy on file with the registrar until the "I" is removed or the time limit for removal has passed. A final grade shall be assigned when the work agreed upon has been completed and evaluated. The "I" may be removed no later than one year following the end of the term in which

it was assigned. If the "I" is not removed within the prescribed time limit, in courses graded on the A - F scale, it shall converted to an evaluative letter grade. In courses evaluated on a "CR/NC" basis, the "I" unremediated within the prescribed time limit shall be counted as an "NC."

The "I" symbol shall not be used in calculating units attempted nor for grade points.

The governing board shall provide a process whereby a student may petition for a time extension due to extraordinary circumstances.

IP — In Progress

The "IP" symbol shall be used to denote that the class extends beyond the normal end of an academic term. It indicates that work is "in progress," but that assignment of a substantive grade must await its completion. The "IP" symbol shall remain on the student's permanent record in order to satisfy enrollment documentation. The appropriate evaluative grade and unit credit shall be assigned and appear on the student's record for the term in which the course is completed. The "IP" shall not be used in calculating grade point averages.

RD — Report Delayed

The "RD" symbol may be assigned by the registrar only. It is to be used when there is a delay in reporting the grade of a student due to circumstances beyond the control of the student. It is a temporary notation to be replaced by a permanent symbol as soon as possible. "RD" shall not be used in calculating grade point averages.

X — Credit by Examination

The "X" shall be added to the evaluative symbol recorded when a course is taken by examination.

W — Withdrawal (Authorized)

Withdrawal from a class or classes shall be authorized during the first 11 weeks or 60% of the term, whichever is less.

No notation (W or other) shall be made on the academic record of the student who withdraws during the first 4 weeks or 30% of a term, whichever is less.

Withdrawal between the fourth and eleventh weeks (or between the 30 and 60% points) of the term shall be recorded as a "W" on the student's record.

During the final 40% of the term, or after the eleventh week withdrawal shall be authorized only by administrative petition and then only for serious and compelling reasons clearly beyond the student's control. All requests for withdrawal shall be in writing and shall require the approval of the instructor and the appropriate college administrator.

Within these guidelines, criteria for withdrawal and the procedures to accomplish it shall be established by local boards and published in college catalogs.

The "W" shall not be used in calculating grade point averages, but excessive "W's" (as defined by local boards) shall be used as factors in probation and dismissal procedures.

51302. ~~Grade~~ Credit-Noncredit Options. (a) The governing board of a district maintaining a Community College may by resolution and regulation offer courses in either or both of the following categories and shall specify in its catalog the category into which each course falls:

(1) Courses wherein all students are evaluated on a "credit-no credit" basis.

When a district offers courses in which there is a single satisfactory standard of performance for which unit credit is assigned, the "CR/NC" grading symbols shall be used to the exclusion of other grades. Credit shall be assigned for meeting that standard, no credit for failure to do so.

(2) Courses wherein each student may elect on registration, or no later than the end of the first 30% of the term whether the basis of ~~his/her~~ evaluation is to be a "credit-no credit" or a letter grade.

(b) All units earned on a "credit-no credit" basis in accredited California institutions of higher education or equivalent out-of-state institutions shall be counted in satisfaction of Community College curriculum requirements. ~~Such units shall be disregarded in determining a student's grade point average for all purposes for which a grade point average is required.~~

(c) The governing board may authorize a student who has received credit for a course taken on a "credit-no credit" basis within the district to convert this to a grade based on a grading scale by taking an appropriate examination. Such authorization shall conform to the standards for repeating enrollment contained in Sections 55002(f), 51315, and 51316.

~~(d) In the absence of a regulation of the type authorized in subdivision (a) of this section, the work in a course will be presumed to be evaluated on the basis of a grading scale.~~

~~(e) The governing board shall establish a policy describing the standards for the award of a "credit" grade for a course.~~

(d) Units earned on a "credit-no credit" basis shall not be used to calculate grade point averages. However, units attempted for which "NC" is recorded shall be considered in probation and dismissal procedures.

(e) Independent study courses offered in accordance with T5/55300-55360 may be graded on a "credit/no credit" basis in accordance with subdivision (a) of this section.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71027, 76224, 76224, 78205 and 78206, Education Code.

History: 1. Former section 51102 amendment and renumbering filed 7-1-71; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 71, No. 27). (Former section 51302 renumbered to 51308).
2. Amendment of section and NOTE filed 11-4-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 45).

~~51308. Grades Offered. (a) The governing board of a district maintaining a Community College may by regulation offer courses in either or both of the following categories and shall specify in its catalog the category or categories in which the course falls:~~

~~(1) Courses wherein all students are evaluated on a "credit-no credit" basis.~~

~~(2) Courses wherein each student may elect on registration, or within a reasonable time thereafter, whether the basis of his evaluation is to be a "credit-no credit" or a letter grade.~~

~~(b) All units earned on a "credit-no credit" basis in California institutions of higher education or equivalent out-of-state institutions shall be counted in satisfaction of Community College curriculum requirements. Such units shall be disregarded in determining a student's grade point average for all purposes for which a grade point average is required.~~

~~(c) The governing board of a district maintaining a Community College may authorize a student who has received credit for a course taken on a "credit-no credit" basis within the district to convert this grade to a letter grade by taking an appropriate examination.~~

~~(d) In the absence of a regulation of the type authorized in subdivision (a) of this section, a course will be presumed to be offered on a letter grade basis.~~

~~NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 76224 and 71027, Education Code.~~

~~History: 1. Renumbering from former Section 51102 filed 7-1-71, effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 71, No. 27).~~
~~2. New Note filed 11-4-77, effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 45).~~

51308. Grade Changes. (a) In any course of instruction in a community college district for which grades are awarded, the instructor of the course shall determine the grade to be awarded each student in accordance with Section 51306 of this chapter. The determination of the student's grade by the instructor shall be final in the absence of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency. Procedures for the correction of grades given in error shall include expunging the incorrect grade from the record.

(b) The governing board may authorize a student who has received credit for a course taken on a "credit-no credit" basis within the district, to convert this to a grade based on a grading scale by taking an appropriate examination. Such authorization shall conform to the standards for repeating enrollment contained in Section 55002(f).

(c) The governing board of a district shall adopt and publish procedures and regulations pertaining to the repetition of courses for which substandard work has been recorded in accordance with Section 55002(f), 51315 and 51316. When grade changes are made in accordance with these Sections, appropriate annotations of any courses repeated shall be entered on the student's permanent academic record in such a manner that all work remains legible, insuring a true and complete academic history.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 76224, 71020, 71025 and 71027, Education Code.

55002. Standards. A graded course shall meet all of the following standards:

(a) The content is organized to meet the requirements for the associate degree as specified in Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 51600) of Division 2 of this part or the requirements for an occupational certificate and is a part of a course of study not exceeding 70 units in length.

(b) It is offered as described in the college catalog, or a supplement thereto, which provides an appropriate title, number, and accurate description of course content. A course outline is available at the college. Course requirements and credit awarded are consistent with Education Code Section 66701.

(c) Only those students who have met the prerequisites for the course are enrolled.

(d) It is subject to the published standards of matriculation, attendance, and achievement of the college.

(e) The students are awarded marks or grades on the basis of methods of evaluation set forth in Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 51300) of Division 2 of this part or to such additional standards as may be established by the governing board of the district.

(f) Enrollment cannot be repeated except to alleviate substandard work which has been recorded on the student's record or in unusual circumstances and with the prior written permission from the district superintendent or authorized representative or representatives.

History: 1. Amendment filed 11-4-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 45)

51315. District Policy for Course Repetition. The governing board of a district maintaining a community college shall adopt and publish procedures or regulations pertaining to the repetition of courses for which substandard work has been recorded. For purposes of course repetition, academic renewal, and all related Title 5 Sections, the term "substandard" shall be defined as meaning course work for which the grading symbols "D," "F," and/or "NC" have been recorded. The procedures or regulations may allow such courses to be repeated and the previous grade and credit to be disregarded in the computation of grade point averages. In such cases, ~~unusual circumstances which justify the repetition of enrollment will be deemed to exist, and~~ the procedure specified in Section 55002(f) and Section 51308 and 51316 of this part shall be followed. When course repetition occurs, the permanent academic record shall be annotated in such a manner that all work remains legible, ensuring a true and complete academic history.

Course repetition may also be permitted when the governing board has designated certain courses that may be repeated for credit. Such courses will be so designated in the college catalog. Courses so designated must provide for either 1) a substantive change in subject matter, e.g., independent study or 2) increasing levels of student performance.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 71020, 71025 and 71027, Education Code. Reference Sections 71025 and 71027, Education Code.

History: 1. New section filed 4-29-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 18).

51316. Course Repetition: Implementation. In adopting procedures or regulations pertaining to the repetition of courses for which substandard academic performance has been previously recorded, the governing board of a district maintaining a community college:

(a) Shall not adopt any regulation or procedure which conflicts with:

(1) Education Code, Section 76224, pertaining to the finality of grades assigned by instructors, and

(2) Chapter 2.5 of Division 10 of Title 5 (commencing with Section 59020), pertaining to the retention and destruction of records and particularly Section 59023(d), relating to the permanency of certain student records;

(b) May permit repetition of any course which was taken in an accredited college or university and for which substandard academic performance as defined in Section 51315 is recorded.

(c) Shall, when adopted precedures or regulations permit course repetition, indicate any specific courses or categories of courses which are exempt from consideration under these regulations;

(d) Shall, in accordance with Title 5, Division 6, Chapter 1, Section 55002(f), deem any course repetition permitted under Title 5, Part VI, Division 2, Chapter 4, Section 51315 to ~~constitute "unusual circumstances" and shall, therefore,~~ require "prior written permission from the district superintendent or the district superintendent's authorized representative or representatives";

(e) Shall clearly indicate any courses repeated under the provisions of this Section and Section 51315 on the student's permanent academic record, using an appropriate symbol;
(f) Shall, when adopted procedures or regulations permit course repetition, publish specific procedures to implement this Section;
(g) May, in determining transfer of a student's credits, honor similar, prior course repetition actions by other accredited colleges and universities; and
(h) Shall maintain a careful record of actions taken under course repetition procedures or regulations adopted in compliance with this Section and Section 51315, since periodic reports may be required by the Chancellor.
Note: Authority cited: Sections 71020, 71025, 71027, Education Code. Reference: Sections 71025 and 71027, Education Code.
History: 1. New section filed 4-29-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 18).
2. Amendment filed 11-4-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 45).

51318. District Policy for Academic Renewal Without Course Repetition. The governing board of a district maintaining a Community College shall adopt and publish procedures or regulations pertaining to the alleviation of previously recorded, substandard academic performance, as defined in Section 51315, which is not reflective of a student's demonstrated ability. Such procedures or regulations shall include a clear statement of the educational principles upon which they are based, and shall be referred to as academic renewal regulations. When academic renewal procedures or regulations adopted by the districts permit previously recorded, substandard course work to be disregarded in the computation of grade point averages, the permanent academic record shall be annotated in such a manner that all work remains legible, insuring a true and complete academic history.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 71020, 71025 and 71027, Education Code. Reference: Sections 71025 and 71027, Education Code.
History: 1. New section filed 4-29-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 18).

51319. Academic Renewal Without Course Repetition: Implementation. In adopting procedures or regulations pertaining to the alleviation of previously recorded, substandard academic performance, as defined in Section 51315 which is not reflective of a student's demonstrated ability, the governing board of a district maintaining a community college:
(a) Shall not adopt any regulation or procedure which conflicts with:
(1) Education Code, Section 76224, pertaining to the finality of grades assigned by instruction, and
(2) Chapter 2.5 of Division 10 of Title 5 (commencing with Section 59020), pertaining to the retention and destruction of records, and particularly Section 59023(d), relating to the permanency of certain student records.

(b) Shall, when the adopted procedures or regulations permit such alleviation, state:

(1) The maximum amount of coursework that may be alleviated;

(2) The amount of academic work to have been completed at a satisfactory level (minimum 2.00) subsequent to the coursework to be alleviated;

(3) The length of time to have elapsed since the coursework to be alleviated was recorded; and

(4) A description of any specific courses and/or categories of courses that are, for any reason, exempt from consideration under the alleviation regulations.

(c) Shall, when the adopted procedures or regulations permit such alleviation, publish specific procedures to be followed in implementing procedures or regulations adopted pursuant to this Section and Section 51318, stating, at a minimum:

(1) The procedures to be followed by students in petitioning for alleviation; and

(2) The officers and/or personnel responsible for implementing the procedures or regulations.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 71020, 71025 and 71027, Education Code. Reference: Sections 71025 and 71027, Education Code.

History: 1. New section filed 4-29-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 18).

51301. Grading Practices. Each governing board maintaining one or more community colleges shall determine a uniform grading practice for the district which shall be based on sound academic principles and conform to the following standards:

(a) Work in all courses acceptable in fulfillment of the requirements for an associate or baccalaureate degree, a certificate, diploma or license shall be graded in accordance with a grading scale adopted by the governing board consistent with Section 51306, or

(b) Be graded in accordance with the provisions of Section 51302 or Section 51302.5. ~~on-a-credit--no-credit-basis. The-governing-board-may-establish-a-deadline-and-make-provisions for-a-student-to-withdraw-from-a-class-without-penalty.~~

Note: Authority cited: Sections 71020, 71024, 71025 and 71027, Education Code.

History: 1. Repealer and new section filed 7-1-71; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 71, No. 27).

2. Amendment of section and Note Filed 11-4-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 45).

51302.5. Credit by Examination. (a) The governing board maintaining one or more community colleges shall adopt and publish procedures and regulations pertaining to credit by examination in accordance with the provisions of this Section and the provisions of Sections 51301, 51302, 51306, 51308, 51315, 51316, 51318 and 55002(f).

(b) The governing board ~~of a district maintaining a Community College~~ may grant credit to any student who satisfactorily passes an examination approved or conducted by proper authorities of the college. Such credit may be granted only to a student who is registered at the college and in good standing and only for a course listed in the catalog of a ~~public~~ the Community College.

(c) All grades derived from credit by examination shall have the letter "X" appended to the evaluative grade symbols.

(d) Units for which credit is given pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not be counted in determining the 12 semester hours of credit in residence required by Section 51632.

History: 1. Amendment filed 7-1-71; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 71, No. 27).
2. Renumbering from Section 51605 filed 10-1-71; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 71, No. 40).
3. Amendment of section and repealer of Note filed 11-4-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 45).

51303. Standards for Probation. (a) A student who has attempted at least 12 semester or 16 quarter units as shown by the official academic record shall be placed on academic probation if the student has earned a grade point average below 2.0 in all units which were graded on the basis of the grading scale described in Section 51306. ~~The district board shall adopt "credit--no credit" probation rules.~~

(b) A student who has enrolled in a total of at least 12 semester or 16 quarter units as shown by the official academic record shall be placed on progress probation when the percentage of all units attempted for which entries of "W" and "NC" are recorded reaches or exceeds a minimum established by the governing board of the district. The governing board shall adopt and publish standards relating to the use of "W" and "NC" for the purposes of probation and dismissal.

~~(c) The district board shall adopt rules setting forth the circumstances that shall warrant exceptions to the standards for probation herein set forth and shall file a copy of such rules with the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.~~

Note: Authority cited: Section 76000, Education Code.

History: 1. New section 51303 through 51307 filed 7-1-71; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 71, No. 27).
2. Amendment of section and Note filed 11-4-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 45).

51303.5. Removal from Probation. (a) A student on academic probation for a grade point deficiency shall be removed from probation when the student's accumulated grade point average is 2.0 or higher.

(b) A student on progress probation because of an excess of units for which entries of "W" and "NC" are recorded shall be removed from probation when the percentage of units in this category drops below the percentage established by the governing board in accordance with Section 51303.

51304. Standards for Dismissal. (a) A student who is on academic probation shall be subject to dismissal if the student earned a cumulative grade point average of less than 1.75 in all units attempted in ~~each of 3 consecutive semesters (6 consecutive quarters)~~ in at least 4 consecutive semesters (6 consecutive quarters) which were graded on the basis of the grading scale described in Section 51306. ~~The district board shall adopt "credit---no credit" dismissal rules.~~

(b) A student who has been placed on progress probation shall be subject to dismissal if the percentage of units in which the student is enrolled for which entries of "W" and "NC" are recorded in at lea t 4 consecutive semesters (6 consecutive quarters) reaches or exceeds the standard established by the governing board in accordance with Section 51303.

(c) The governing board of a district shall adopt and publish procedures and conditions for dismissal and appeal of dismissal and request for reinstatement.

The district board shall adopt rules setting forth the circumstances that shall warrant exceptions to the standards for dismissal herein set forth and shall file a copy of such rules with the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.

Note: Authority cited: Section 71066 and 72285, Education Code.

History: 1. Amendment of section and new Note filed 11-4-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 45).

51307. Notification of Probation and Dismissal. Each Community College shall make every reasonable effort to notify a student of probation or dismissal ~~no later than the fifth day of classes of the~~ at or near the beginning of the semester or quarter in which it will ~~be~~ take effect but, in any case, no later than the start of the fall semester or quarter. Each community college shall also make every reasonable effort to provide counseling and other support services to a student on probation to help the student overcome any academic difficulties. Each community college shall make every reasonable effort to notify a student of removal from probation or reinstatement after dismissal within timelines established by the distirct. Probation and dismissal policies and procedures shall be published in the college catalog.

APPENDIX A

GRADING POLICIES STUDY GROUP

Faculty

Ms. Maryamber Villa (Chairperson)
Professor of History
Los Angeles Valley College
5800 Fulton Avenue
Van Nuys, CA 91401

Mr. Robert Sysum
Instructor in Vocational Education
Los Medanos College
2700 East Leland Road
Pittsburg, CA 94565

Mr. Steve Kellogg
Instructor in Biology
Chaffey College
5885 Haven Avenue
Alta Loma, CA 91701

Ms. Susan Petit
Instructor, English
College of San Mateo
1700 West Hillsdale Blvd.
San Mateo, CA 94402

Mr. Doug Sabiston
Instructor, Business
Contra Costa College
2600 Mission Bell Drive
San Pablo, CA 94806

Vice Chancellor, Educational Planning

Dr. John T. McCuen
Vice Chancellor, Ed. Planning & Develop.
Los Angeles Community College District
617 West 7th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dean of Instruction

Mr. Robert Martincich
Dean of Instruction
Contra Costa College
2600 Mission Bell Drive
San Pablo, CA 94806

Dean of Students

Mr. Josue Hoyos
Dean of Students
Canada College
4200 Farm Hill Blvd.
Redwood City, CA 94061

Dean of Admissions and Records

Dr. Margaret Dominici
Assoc, Dean of Admissions and Records
Shasta College
1065 North Old Oregon Trail
Redding, CA 96001

Student

Mr. Bill Bowie
Student Representative
Ventura College
4667 Telegraph Road
VEntura, CA 93003

Chancellor's Office Liaison

Mr. Allan Petersen
Administrator, Program Evaluation and Approval

Dr. John Meyer, Specialist
Program Evaluation and Approval

Dr. Gerhardt Steinke, Specialist
Program Evaluation and Approval

APPENDIX B
(Excerpts from Title 5)

51302. Grade Options. (a) The governing board may by resolution offer courses in either or both of the following categories:

(1) Courses wherein all students are evaluated on a "credit--no credit" basis.

(2) Courses wherein each student may elect on registration, or within such time thereafter as the district governing board may determine by rules and regulations, whether the basis of the student's evaluation is to be "credit--no credit" or a grading scale.

(b) All units earned on a "credit--no credit" basis in accredited California institutions of higher education or equivalent out-of-state institutions shall be counted in satisfaction of Community College curriculum requirements. Such units shall be disregarded in determining a student's grade point average for all purposes for which a grade point average is required.

(c) The governing board may authorize a student who has received credit for a course taken on a "credit--no credit" basis within the district to convert this to a grade based on a grading scale by taking an appropriate examination.

(d) In the absence of a regulation of the type authorized in subdivision (a) of this section, the work in a course will be presumed to be evaluated on the basis of a grading scale.

(e) The governing board shall establish a policy describing the standards for the award of a "credit" grade for a course.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 78205 and 78206, Education Code.

History:
1. Former section 51102 amendment and renumbering filed 7-1-71; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 71, No. 27). (Former section 51307 renumbered to 51308).
2. Amendment of section and NOTE filed 11-4-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 45).

51308. Grades Offered. (a) The governing board of a district maintaining a Community College may by regulation offer courses in either or both of the following categories and shall specify in its catalog the category or categories in which the course falls:

(1) Courses wherein all students are evaluated on a "credit--no credit" basis.

(2) Courses wherein each student may elect on registration or within a reasonable time thereafter, whether the basis of his evaluation is to be a "credit--no credit" or a letter grade.

(b) All units earned on a "credit--no credit" basis in California institutions of higher education or equivalent out-of-state institutions shall be counted in satisfaction of Community College curriculum requirements. Such units shall be disregarded in determining a student's grade point average for all purposes for which a grade point average is required.

(c) The governing board of a district maintaining a Community College may authorize a student who has received credit for a course taken on a "credit--no credit" basis within the district to convert this grade to a letter grade by taking an appropriate examination.

(d) In the absence of a regulation of the type authorized in subdivision (a) of this section, a course will be presumed to be offered on a letter-grade basis.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 76224 and 71027, Education Code.

History: 1. Renumbering from former Section 51102 filed 7-1-71; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 71, No. 27).
2. New NOTE filed 11-4-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 45).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 30 1979

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES